

REMARKS

This Amendment is made in response to the final Office Action dated September 21, 2005. Claims 1-5 and 32-43 are pending. By this Amendment, claims 32, 36 and 38 have been amended to better define the presently claimed invention. Applicants have carefully reviewed the arguments presented in the final Office Action and respectfully request reconsideration of the claims in view of the remarks presented below.

Applicants thank the Examiner for indication that claims 1-5 are allowed.

Claims 38-40 and 43 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102 (e) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 6,663,652 to Daniel et al. (the "Daniel patent"). Applicants note that claim 38 has been amended to recite that the coating is selectively deposited only on portions of the strut assembly proximal to the filter. Applicants submit that claim 38 is no longer open ended since the selective deposition of the coating excludes the rest of the regions of the device. The Daniel patent simply does not disclose the use of selective depositing of coatings on a filtering device, as acknowledged by the Examiner in paragraph 3 of the Office Action. Applicants respectfully request the Examiner to withdraw the Daniel patent as an anticipatory reference.

Claims 32-37, 41 and 42 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103 (a) as being unpatentable over the Daniel patent in view of U.S. Patent No. 5,928,260 to Chin et al. (the "Chin patent"). Applicants note that claim 32 has been amended to recite that the layer of polymeric material is deposited only on portions of strut assembly proximal to the filter. Claim 36, likewise, has been amended to recite that the layer of polymeric material is deposited only on regions of the regions of the strut assembly which experience low strain. Again, as mentioned above, the Daniel patent fails to teach the use of selective depositing of a polymeric material, or any other material, only on portions of the strut assembly proximal to the filter. Applicants submit that claims 32 and 36, like claim 38, are no longer open ended since the claims recite the selective deposition of the

coating only on portions of the strut assembly which excludes the remaining regions of the device. The Chin patent, likewise, fails to teach the use of selective depositing of a polymeric coating, or a similar material, only on particular portions of the strut assembly. Therefore, Applicants submit that the claimed invention would not be obvious over the Daniel patent in view of the Chin patent.

In view of the foregoing, it is respectfully urged that all of the present claims of the application are patentable and in a condition for allowance. The undersigned attorney can be reached at (310) 824-5555 to facilitate prosecution of this application, if necessary.

In light of the above amendments and remarks, Applicants respectfully request that a timely Notice of Allowance be issued in this case.

Respectfully submitted,

FULWIDER PATTON LEE & UTECHT, LLP

By:   
Thomas H. Majcher  
Registration No. 31,119

THM:gbr

Howard Hughes Center  
6060 Center Drive, Tenth Floor  
Los Angeles, CA 90045  
Telephone: (310) 824-5555  
Facsimile: (310) 824-9696  
Customer No. 24201

104357.1